

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/627,354	KURRASCH ET AL.	
	Examiner Rodney B. White	Art Unit 3636	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rodney B. White. (3) _____.

(2) Gregory H. Zavia (#48,059). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 June 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 38,39,43 and 44.

Identification of prior art discussed: Rogers, III et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,556,163).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



RODNEY B. WHITE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed adding language to Claim 38 that would render it patentably distinct over the Rogers, III et al reference. Specifically, it needed to be clear that adjustments to the seat to suit different occupants and the ability of the chair to be restored to its original pre-programmed default position was achieved by no manipulation or operation of controls or actuators by the occupant. It was agreed to add language about the default position being pre-programmed into the microprocessor, that the transducer detects a previous user rising from the chair or detects when a new user occupies the chair, and that the microprocessor engages the actuator and the actuator automatically restores the seat to the default position. The proposed Examiner's Amendment was agreed upon and will be entered as such.